

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

February 20, 2007

A meeting of the City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Michael A. Schoedel, City Manager
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
James Liberman
Debbie Igielnik
Marc Lopata

Absent:

Mark Zorensky

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES – MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5th, 2007 PLAN COMMISSION/ ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

The minutes of the meeting of February 5, 2007 were presented for approval. The minutes were approved after having been previously distributed to each individual member.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 301 N. FORSYTH (CONTINUED)

Mark and John Rodgers, owners/developers, and Thomas McKenzie, project architect, were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that at the February 5, 2007 Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting, the members had concerns with the design of the front entry door facing Forsyth which featured a tall Palladian window occupying the first and second floor. Members of the ARB felt that the design was too elaborate and was not compatible with the neighborhood. The architect has since

redesigned the entryway by adding a smaller window on the second story thereby separating the first floor entryway from the second story. Additionally, at the previous ARB meeting, the applicant proposed a mixed red brick instead of the previously proposed gray brick. To match the new brick color, windows will be double-hung, white in color. All other aspects of the design remain the same as previously submitted. An at grade side-entry two-car garage is proposed. According to the applicant, the garage door is to be steel panel, white in color. The driveway is shared with 311 North Forsyth and will be constructed of exposed aggregate concrete. The roofing material will be architectural shingles, gray in color. Trash will be located in an enclosure off the driveway turnaround screened with a brick wing wall and ornamental gate. The HVAC units are adjacent to the trash area and are also screened with a brick wing wall and metal gate. The applicant has revised the appearance of the residence resulting in a design that is more sensitive to the neighborhood. The front entry design is much improved and the mixed red brick color is compatible with the neighborhood. Staff's recommendation is to approve as revised/submitted.

Mr. Mark Rodgers indicated that the front of the structure has been re-designed to remove the 2-story entry way. Samples of the brick (mixed red) and roofing material were presented.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented about the surround around the door; he asked if the area behind the second floor window is usable space.

Mr. Mark Rodgers indicated that the entrance is "tucked-in" and that the house has a 2-story entry foyer.

Jim Liberman commented about the 2 door entryway.

Mr. McKenzie stated that the entryway can be made wider so as to add a sidelight.

Mr. Mark Rodgers stated that they wanted the entryway to simulate a French door.

Ms. Vivian Eveloff, owner of 8318 Kingsbury, commented that this corner property is at a higher elevation than surrounding properties and therefore, this house is taller than those around it and she is concerned that it will tower over the other residences. She commented that Clayton Gardens has gone from smaller, 1-story structures to large, 2-story structures with peaked roofs.

Catherine Powers explained the height mitigation as required by the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District (UDD) when a structure is constructed adjacent to a 1-story structure. She stated that, however, in this case, the house adjacent to this one is a new, 2-story structure.

Ms. Eveloff stated that the house next door on Kingsbury is a 1-story house.

Steve Lichtenfeld referred to Sheet 4.1 (south/rear elevation). He asked if the one-story portion at the rear of the house is considered height mitigation.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Chairman Sanger asked if staff is confident that the structure has provided height mitigation according to the UDD Standards.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted/revised. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE - #6 SOUTHMOOR

Mr. Paul Fendler, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for the construction of a 1,534 square foot addition to the rear of the existing 4,752 square foot residence. The addition is less than 50% of the total square footage of the existing residence; therefore, site plan review is not required. The addition will incorporate a new solarium on the first floor and new master bath and bedroom on the second floor. The height of the addition is approximately 24 feet which is lower than existing primary hip roof. The plans show the addition to be constructed of brick to match existing. The roof will be clay tile to match existing. Windows will be casement to match existing. The HVAC units are located within a wood fenced enclosure on the east side. The existing trash area on the west side will remain. No trees are required to be removed to accommodate the addition. The applicant indicates that there are storm damaged trees near the addition which need to be removed but are not associated with this application. A re-aligned exposed aggregate driveway is also proposed. The applicant will need to obtain Public Works Department approval of the new location and build the approach to the department's specifications prior to receiving a building permit. The plans indicate that the existing impervious coverage is approximately 33% and the new impervious coverage is 37%. The maximum allowable impervious coverage for this property is 55%. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to approve as submitted with the condition that the applicant receive Public Works Department approval for the location of the driveway approach prior to building permit issuance.

Mr. Fendler stated this addition will be atop the existing one story portion of the house which was constructed some time ago. He stated the brick texture will be matched to what is existing and that the clay tile roof and windows will also match. A sample of the brick, window and paint sample (wheat straw) was presented.

Jim Liberman asked about drainage on the west side.

Chairman Sanger reminded Jim that site plan review is not applicable in this instance and therefore, drainage is not a portion of the review.

Debbie Igielnik asked about the driveway.

Catherine Powers advised the members that the Public Works Department reviews driveway approaches.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff's recommendation that the Public Works Department review and approve the new driveway approach prior to issuance of the building permit. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the Board.

SIGNAGE – 8025 MARYLAND (MARYLAND WALK PROJECT)

Bill MacFarlane, Conrad Properties, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance were:

Kevin Kloster, President, Conrad Properties
Tim Kelley, Enterprise Bank & Trust
Steve Calhoun, ASI (sign contractor)

Mr. MacFarlane stated that they believe the signs to be both sophisticated and elegant and represents what signage is desired. He stated he realizes this signage to be different than the conceptual signage that was presented back in June, but that was prior to the building having a tenant. He advised the members that Enterprise has actually purchased the building space so they are an owner, not a tenant. He stated the proposed wall sign is small when compared to the width of the building and that the location of the wall sign is actually at the first floor ceiling level (an elevation drawing was shown to the members). Mr. MacFarlane stated they believe the sign to be of appropriate size and position. He then presented the position of the “Maryland Walk” signage on the building, noting that it is at the other end of the building, where the entrance to Maryland Walk actually is located.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the bank will share the same address as Maryland Walk (8025 Maryland Avenue).

Mr. MacFarlane replied “yes”. He then presented the previous locations of the wall signage as approved during their presentation back in June. These 3 signs are located above the awnings.

Jim Liberman asked the square footage of the bank.

Mr. MacFarlane replied “about 10,000 square feet.”

Jim Liberman asked the square footage of the building.

Mr. MacFarlane replied “about 275,000 square feet.”

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the bank owns the plaza area.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated that a portion of the plaza will be the bank’s property.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that he believes the wall sign to be in the wrong location and that it makes the building appear that it is called “Enterprise Bank & Trust” rather than “Maryland Walk”. He stated the previous proposal depicted a better location for the sign. He suggested it be relocated to the second bay.

Debbie Igielnik stated that she agreed that with the proposed signage, the name of the building appears to be “Enterprise Bank & Trust”.

Mr. MacFarlane advised the members that one cannot enter “Maryland Walk” from this corner of the building; he stated the entrance to the commercial space (the bank) is at a different location than the residential portion.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the condominium owners have been made aware of this signage.

Mr. MacFarlane replied “no”.

Jim Liberman asked if this will be a typical bank with walk-in customers.

Mr. Kelley indicated that this is a private and trust bank and will not operate the same as their other location at 150 N. Meramec which is located just a few blocks from this location. He stated this location will serve higher end clients and will not have a typical bank lobby area.

Chairman Sanger asked if this is more of a destination type bank.

Mr. Kelley replied “yes”.

Jim Liberman stated he believes this signage gives a false impression that the building is a commercial building rather than what it truly is; a residential building.

Catherine Powers advised the members that this is the maximum size signage allowed at 50 square feet.

Mr. Kelley stated this is a high profile location.

Chairman Sanger asked where the entrances to the bank are located.

Mr. MacFarlane pointed out the entrances on the plans, one entrance near each corner of the building.

Mike Schoedel asked Mr. MacFarlane if they would be willing to move the wall sign over the entrance.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated they would consider that.

Mike Schoedel asked that the ground sign be discussed at this time.

Mr. MacFarlane provided an explanation of the ground sign (the sign to be erected on the existing curved wall). A sample of the material for this sign was presented.

Mr. Calhoun stated the letters for the wall sign will be self-contained; channel letters mounted directly on the building and will utilize LED low-voltage lights. A sample of a letter was presented. Mr. Calhoun apologized for the sample, stating it is a blocky letter, but he brought it in to show the members the lighting effect. He stated the letters have a 1/8” hole at the bottom so as to provide drainage.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there will be light leakage from the top of the letters.

Mr. Calhoun indicated that he did not believe there would be. He stated the actual size of the proposed lettering is 17 5/8” (the sample is 18 3/4”).

Marc Lopata stated that the owner of the condominium unit that is located above this signage should provide approval.

Steve Lichtenfeld agreed.

Chairman Sanger asked if it would be preferable to have the letters back-lit.

Catherine Powers stated there really is no preference as long as the light leakage is minimal.

Mr. MacFarlane began discussing the ground sign to be located on the existing curved brick wall. He stated he believes it meets the Ordinance as it is less than 25 square feet. He stated they prefer this location as it identifies the space as that of Enterprise.

Chairman Sanger asked if this sign is lit.

Mr. MacFarlane replied "no".

Mr. Calhoun indicated that it is a baked enamel white finish with gold logo. A sample of the material was shown.

Marc Lopata asked if this location is a public or private entrance.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated it is both.

Debbie Igielnik asked the square footage of the wall sign.

Mr. MacFarlane replied about 50 square feet.

Jim Liberman asked if staff is indicating that the size meets the Ordinance.

Catherine Powers replied "yes". She stated the location of the sign is the issue and that the signage gives the building the appearance of being commercial versus residential. She stated at one time, the plaza area outside what will now be the bank was a public plaza.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the ground sign is limited to 25 square feet and the wall sign limited to 50 square feet.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Mr. MacFarlane commented that three signs were approved back in June.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that he only recalls two wall signs approved in June and each was located over the entrance doors to the lower level which indicated where the business was to be located as opposed to these two signs this evening. He stated the entire context of the building and site needs to be considered rather than the individual tenant space. He stated if one sign is moved then the other would probably need to be moved also.

Chairman Sanger asked about moving the wall sign over the awning and back lighting the ground sign.

Debbie Igielnik stated it is a big sign to move over the awning. She stated she has no objection to the ground sign.

Chairman Sanger stated he is concerned with the lighting.

At this time, members looked at the National City wall sign located across the street from City Hall.

Mr. Calhoun stated that their sign will look smaller as their sign is “boxy”. He stated that additionally, their sign will be LED and he believes the National City sign is neon. He stated their sign also has a 2-inch stroke versus theirs which is probably a 5 or 6-inch stroke.

Chairman Sanger asked if this sign will have narrower letters.

Mr. Calhoun replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he believes with this signage, people will call the building the Enterprise Bank building. He stated he agrees signage for the bank is needed and suggests moving the wall sign to above the canopy. He stated he agrees that no lighting is needed for the ground sign.

Mike Schoedel asked if the condominium owners/tenants play a role in this type matter.

Mr. Kloster stated that this is their decision as the developer.

Mike Schoedel asked for clarification of the Chairman’s earlier suggestion that the wall sign be moved over so that it is positioned above the awning on the glass as originally proposed and that the ground sign remain in its proposed location.

Marc Lopata suggested Enterprise signage be located above each entrance and that “Maryland Walk” signage be placed on the curved wall.

Mr. MacFarlane stated they do not want a Maryland Walk sign on the curved wall as this would confuse people as to the location of the entrance to the residential portion of the building.

Chairman Sanger commented that National City occupies the majority of the building and that that building is also all commercial space.

Mr. Calhoun advised the members that an illuminated sign cannot be tied into the spandrel glass.

Samples of existing signage that is located above the first floor were distributed.

Jason Jaggi commented that those signs also needed approval for modification to the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Kelley suggested moving the sign over to the brick versus the glass and have it non-illuminated.

Chairman Sanger stated he would marginally approve that.

Mike Schoedel stated that would be fine with him, although that would result in none of the bank's signage being illuminated.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated the size of the letters needs to also be considered.

Mr. Calhoun stated that if the letters get much smaller, they could not be illuminated.

Chairman Sanger asked if the condo unit above the location of the wall sign has been sold.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated that he did not believe it had been sold yet.

Chairman Sanger asked if they would agree to put a timer on the sign.

Mr. Kelley replied "yes".

Chairman Sanger suggested the wall sign be approved with the condition that it be moved over and that the lights go off at 11 p.m.

Catherine Powers stated that could be an enforcement issue as City Hall staff is not working at 11 p.m.

Mike Schoedel commented that the condo owner will know if the lights do not go off.

Jason Jaggi stated that the Sign Permit could include the element of a timer.

Being no further questions or comments, Mike Schoedel made a motion to approve the ground sign as submitted (note that it is NOT illuminated), that the wall sign be approved with the conditions that the letters be face lit channel letters, that it be moved over to balance with the Maryland Avenue entrance sign on the wall (brick) of the building and that the lights be turned off no later than 11:00 p.m. CST/daylight savings time and that these conditions be included in the Sign Permit. Additionally, a modification to the Sign Ordinance is hereby approved. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and received the following vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Mike Schoedel, Steve Lichtenfeld, Jim Liberman and Debbie Igielnik. Nays: Marc Lopata.

CITY BUSINESS-DISCUSSION OF TRANSIT ORIENTED OVERLAY DISTRICT (TOD)

Catherine Powers reminded the members that an outline for two TOD Districts in August, 2006 and at the request of the members has been placed on this agenda for further discussion. She stated that basically, the TOD Districts will encourage mixed-use, medium/high density development adjacent to the Forsyth and Central Avenue Metro-Link Stations. Parking criteria would be reduced because of the proximity to Metro-Link in exchange for public benefits including public gathering areas and LEED Certification. She stated that this item can be discussed in greater detail or the language can be placed in the Zoning Ordinance for public hearing and determination.

Jim Liberman asked if this would change the existing zoning designations.

Catherine Powers stated that the designations would not be changed; the areas would just become an overlay district. She stated that most developments in a TOD District would be Planned Unit Developments.

A discussion regarding the boundaries ensued. Mike Schoedel asked why the boundary did not include properties all the way to Hanley Road.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff was considering how far people would be willing to walk, but that the boundaries can certainly be adjusted.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the Washington University west garage is zoned both C-2 and R-4.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked what the properties to the north are zoned.

Catherine Powers replied “R-2”.

Marc Lopata commented that it would be wonderful if the City had a trolley.

Mike Schoedel indicated that implementing a trolley system was discussed and that the problems are how to pay for ongoing maintenance and how often to run the trolley.

Marc Lopata suggested a token system.

Chairman Sanger stated he envisions a San Francisco type system. He stated he would agree with Mike that the boundary line be expanded to include Hanley Road. He asked how to proceed from here.

Catherine Powers stated that this item can be further discussed or the language can be placed into the Zoning Ordinance.

Mike Schoedel recommended incorporating the language into the Zoning Ordinance.

Debbie Igielnik commented that she sees no mention of FAR in the HDC components.

Catherine Powers stated that it was probably overlooked and would be included.

Jim Liberman commented that the Forsyth Station area zoned C-2 is expensive property.

Catherine Powers stated that C-2 has a height limitation of 7 stories.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated there is the need to protect the residential neighborhood to the north.

Mike Schoedel stated the importance to clearly document what is wanted north of Forsyth.

Catherine Powers commented that those sites are shallow and would be challenging. She stated that the TOD District would mandate higher density in the HDC, but not in the C-2 area.

Marc Lopata asked if the standard boundaries are ¼ mile.

Jason Jaggi stated that is the starting point, but that variables are considered.

Marc Lopata stated that he believes that overall, the TOD is a great idea.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked how far the station is from Hanley Road.

Jason Jaggi indicated that it is more than ¼ mile. He added that the boundaries as currently drawn are more than ¼ mile.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that a TOD Overlay District seems to demand higher density and for that reason, maybe the R-4 area should be excluded.

Catherine Powers stated they could exclude the R-4 reasons. She stated they were included for parking reasons.

Marc Lopata stated the Lyle Avenue is about ¼ mile.

Jason Jaggi agreed.

Catherine Powers commented that the natural barrier would be Hanley Road.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated his concern that we could be sending the wrong message to the area north of Forsyth in that the City wants higher density there.

Catherine Powers stated the document will be reviewed and re-worked.

Mike Schoedel advised the members that a feasibility study has been ordered from Arcturis on a new Police Station to help identify possible locations and needs.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Recording Secretary